

REMARKS

This Amendment serves as a submission accompanying a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) being filed herewith.

Claims 6 and 11 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 9 and 14 have been canceled. Claims 6 to 8, 10 to 13, and 15 to 20 are now pending.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments to the claims, and the below remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Claims 6 to 8, 10 to 13, 15

In the earlier Office Action made final, claims 6 to 8, 10 to 13, and 15, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,170,005 to Meandzija (“Meandzija reference”) in view of WO 96/07267 to Chaney (“Chaney reference”).

The Meandzija reference refers to synchronization and information exchange between communication components using a network management operations and control paradigm.

The Chaney reference refers to a system processing a video signal including a plurality of signal components representing respective ones of a plurality of video programs such as pay-TV programs.

In contrast, amended claim 6 is directed to a method for clearing a customer-specific entitlement in a conditional access system to receive a chargeable service from a service provider by using a security module including: specifically assigning an EMM clearing signal to the security module to provide a specifically assigned EMM clearing signal; and controlling a right-of-access by a customer through a service center, in response to a request from the service provider to the service center, using the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal by performing one of: (i) an indirect clearing operation of: sending the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal from the service center to the service provider via at least one of a telephone system and a data communication system; feeding the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal for the chargeable service into a control unit of the service provider; and activating the security module via the control unit by using the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal; and (ii) a direct clearing operation by sending the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal from the service center, with an assistance of a data transmission service in a digital broadcasting service, to the security module to clear the customer. Neither reference – alone or in combination – describe each and every feature of claim 6 as required. For example, the Meandzija reference concerns agent components (e.g., hardware used at the head end or uplink site of a television network) to provide conditional access to a television

signal by inserting conditional access data into the transmitted programming, where management information bases are provided for the agent components and the agent components update their management information bases with changes in a television schedule. According to the reference, the management component reads the management information bases to obtain the updated information and store its own management information base. The Meandzija reference **does not** teach or suggest the security focus and the associated required features of the present invention, e.g., the multi-step tasks of claim 6. The Chaney reference also **does not** teach or suggest the security focus, and instead appears to concern itself with basically system processing of a video signal. In addition, the Meandzija and Chaney references, alone and in combination, do not teach an approximate location of the querying customer is found with the assistance of at least one of a digital cellular network and a mobile telephony network; *and* the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal for clearing the querying customer is only routed into a digital broadcasting network in which the querying customer is situated at a time of a call and an ordering of the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal, as required by amended claim 6.

Because the Meandzija and Chaney references do not expressly recite all of the features of claim 6, they cannot render obvious claim 6. The remaining claims 7, 8, 10 to 13 and 15, are either dependent on or recite features analogous to those required by claim 6, and thus, are allowable for at least the same reasons. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 6 to 8, 10 to 13, and 15 are allowable; and, withdrawal of the rejection of those claims is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Claims 9, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20

Claims 9, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Meandzija reference in view of the Chaney reference and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,448 to Hayes, Jr. (“Hayes reference”).

As discussed above, the Meandzija reference in combination with the Chaney reference does not teach or suggest the features of claim 6, nor of claims 11 or 16 which recites features analogous to some of claim 6. Likewise, the Hayes reference does not cure those deficiencies.

The Hayes reference recites a method and apparatus for effectuating unidirectional and bidirectional communication directly between a mobile telephone and another device without the use of a mobile telephone to carry. The Hayes reference also **does not** teach or

suggest the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal for clearing the querying customer which is only routed into a digital broadcasting network in which the querying customer is situated at a time of a call and an ordering of the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal as required by the present claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6, 11, 16, 17, 19, and 20 are allowable over the cited art. Claims 9 and 14 were canceled, and any rejection of those claims is moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Claim 18

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Meandzija reference in view of the Chaney reference and further in view of the Hayes reference and the Swift reference.

As discussed above, the Meandzija reference in combination with the Chaney and Hayes references does not teach or suggest the features of claim 6, nor of claim 16 which recites features analogous to some of claim 6. Likewise, the Swift reference does not cure those deficiencies, and *does not* teach or suggest specifically assigning an EMM clearing signal to the security module, *nor* controlling a right-of-access using the specifically assigned EMM clearing signal by performing as described in the claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 is allowable over the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the rejections of claims 6 to 8, 10 to 13, and 15 to 20 in the present application have been obviated, and that all pending claims 6 to 8, 10 to 13, and 15 to 20 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 9, 2010 By: /Linda Lecomte/
Linda Shudy Lecomte (Reg. No. 47,084)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646